

# Town Meeting



Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

## Will the Third Party Bring Us Peace and Prosperity?

*Moderator,* GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

### *Speakers*

GLEN H. TAYLOR

DOROTHY THOMPSON

JAMES STEWART MARTIN

DWIGHT MACDONALD

*(See also page 13)*

### COMING

—May 4, 1948—

Should the United Nations Be Revised With or  
Without Russia Now?





# CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

## THE BROADCAST OF APRIL 27:

### "Will the Third Party Bring Us Peace and Prosperity?"

<i>Mr.</i> DENNY .....	3
<i>Senator</i> TAYLOR .....	4
<i>Miss</i> THOMPSON .....	6
<i>Mr.</i> MARTIN .....	8
<i>Mr.</i> MACDONALD .....	11
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN.....	13
QUESTIONS, PLEASE! .....	17



## THE BROADCAST OF MAY 4:

### "Should the United Nations Be Revised With or Without Russia Now?"



The Broadcast of April 27, 1948, originated in Armory Auditorium, Charlotte, North Carolina, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EST., over the American Broadcasting Company Network.



Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

# Illinois U Library

# Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR  
GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



APRIL 27, 1948

VOL. 14, No. 1

## Will the Third Party Bring Us Peace and Prosperity?

### Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. You must excuse a native North Carolinian for expressing a little genuine enthusiasm for returning to the old home state, especially in the springtime, and especially to discuss politics in an election year.

While ruthless dictators continue to make a mockery of democratic procedures, we had better be interested in this and in every other free election. We cannot be reminded too often that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom and that means the kind of vigilance your Town Meeting has been trying to stir up throughout this country for the last 13 years.

You and I have had the privilege of hearing some of the ablest minds in America during these past 13 years. We've watched them use the rational process to come to diametrically opposite conclusions with the same set of facts before them. So, we must conclude that the rational process is a

very unreliable process. That is, unless we hear both sides. For if it is possible for one side to be wrong, it's also possible for the other side to be wrong.

Tonight we have the privilege of hearing both sides. First, two spokesmen for a new political party which is presently referred to as the Third Party. One of these spokesmen is now a United States Senator and is a candidate for the nomination of Vice President on this new party's ticket.

The party slogan is Peace and Prosperity. Our other two speakers challenge this slogan and the methods by which the party seeks to attain peace and prosperity. So it's up to you to examine the arguments of both sides and make up your own mind.

To represent you here tonight is a fine audience of several thousand Carolinians who will ask questions in your behalf. We hear first from the Senator from the State of Idaho, now seeking the office of Vice President on the new



party ticket, the Honorable Glen H. Taylor. Senator Taylor. (*Applause.*)

### Senator Taylor:

Mr. Denny, I believe the question for this evening is incorrect in alluding to the new party as the Third Party. The two old parties have become almost identical in every respect. A study of recent votes in the Congress reveals their unanimity on foreign policy and most domestic issues hardly exceeded by the Adolf Hitler Reichstag.

The new party is not a third party. It is in reality the second party. Millions of Americans want this country to support the United Nations. Millions of Americans are not convinced that war with Russia is inevitable and crave only peace.

Yet if the new party had not entered the field, these patriotic, peace-loving citizens would have had no way of protesting against the way the bipartisan coalition has by-passed, undermined, and nearly destroyed the United Nations by a unilateral mishandling of the Greek problem, the betrayal of the United Nations by welshing on the proposal to partition Palestine which we sponsored and to which Russia agreed.

The American people should have an opportunity to vote against this bipartisan, Wall Street, military clique which has brought dishonor to America by reducing

our solemn agreements and commitments to the status of scraps of paper in the evil traditions of Adolf Hitler, all to protect the interests of the oil monopolists in the Middle East.

When Hitler invaded Russia Mr. Truman said, "Good. I hope they kill each other off. We should help whoever is losing to make sure they do."

Miss Thompson, Mr. MacDonald, how can we expect the Russians to have confidence that a man who spoke in such a manner then has peaceful intentions toward them now? Every other prospective presidential candidate has made equally anti-Russian statements.

Henry Wallace is the only American of sufficient stature to aspire to the Presidency who has not succumbed to the lure of seeking headlines in our reactionary corporate-controlled press by making inflammatory statements against Russia and trying to blame all our troubles on communism.

In electing Henry Wallace the American people will serve notice on the world, and particularly Russia, that we have repudiated the warmakers and that we want peace. In those changed circumstances, I am confident that Henry Wallace could bring an honorable end to the cold war, make it possible for the Russians and ourselves to stop our imperialistic and expansionist tactics, secure a just and honorable peace for all concerned, and then

proceed to rebuild the United Nations and bring about world disarmament. (*Applause.*)

I believe that after a few years sufficient confidence and mutual trust could be established to enable us to turn the United Nations into a genuine world government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law and maintaining permanent world peace.

Once relieved of the staggering burden of armaments and preparations for war, we could proceed to the tasks necessary to create permanent prosperity here at home.

With only a fraction of the money we are now spending on war preparation, we could develop our river valleys along the lines of the TVA, protect our citizens from disastrous floods, generate fabulous amounts of electrical power needed to expand our industries, reclaim hundreds of thousands of arid acres in the West, the products from which could be utilized to develop a farm program through the United Nations calculated to meet the food requirements of humanity everywhere.

With part of the money saved by abandoning war, we could build homes for veterans, give our old people pensions of at least \$100 a month, expand our educational facilities, build highways, develop atomic energy for peacetime uses. We could do all of these things with the money we now spend on preparations for war and still have

enough left to permit a decent tax reduction and then make substantial payments on our national debt and free ourselves from the bondage of Wall Street. (*Applause.*)

The great corporations and cartels will be brought under control by vigorous anti-trust enforcement and if that won't do the job, we may have to nationalize some of them in order that the little businessman and genuine free enterprise may continue to flourish and grow in America.

Yes, and the new party will outlaw discrimination. I may say here that I'm happy to see Negroes in this audience tonight—no segregation. That is because the new party practices what it preaches, and we insisted that there should be no segregation in this meeting tonight. (*Applause.*)

The new party will end the fear engendered by the vast secret police organization which is intimidating honest citizens all over America. When the new party comes to power, we may have a temporary wave of unemployment because there will be so many secret policemen looking for honest jobs. (*Applause.*)

**Moderator Denny:**

Thank you, Senator Taylor. I ought to say on behalf of our next two speakers that they were unanimous in agreeing with Senator Taylor and his associate that they approve the idea of nonsegregated audiences.



Our next speaker has won international fame for her work as a foreign correspondent, author, and lecturer. She has been called the First Lady of American Journalism—and other things—for she never fears to step into the middle of a raging controversy and speak her mind if she thinks she's prepared to discuss the subject. Tonight she believes she is prepared for Senator Taylor, Mr. Wallace, or any of the leaders of the third party. Many of you will remember her debate with the Senator on Town Meeting last fall and will welcome this return engagement.

Miss Dorothy Thompson, syndicated columnist of the column, "On the Record," and distinguished author and Town Hall lecturer. Miss Thompson. (*Applause.*)

#### Miss Thompson:

My friends, I am not a militarist and I am not a banker. I agree with Senator Taylor that his party should not be called a third party, nor should it be called a new party. It should be called what it is—a communist program in a new look. (*Applause.*)

Your speech, Senator Taylor, which whitewashes every Soviet betrayal of solemn agreement and every unilateral Soviet action and presents the United States as the world's chief menace, without a friend on earth, just confirms this statement I've made.

The Communist Party—let's tell

the truth—initiated the movement for Wallace. No other group publicly called for it. It was launched November 18 by Ben Gold, Communist president of the Fur Workers' Union, C.I.O.

The second call was made December 9 at a mass meeting in New York by William Z. Foster, chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. This was endorsed eight days later by the Communist-friendly organization, Progressive Citizens of America. Leading non-Communist figures immediately resigned.

Mr. Wallace had not yet spoken himself when the Moscow *Pravda* announced that a third party would enter the 1948 election, and on December 29, Mr. Wallace accepted.

The support for this so-called liberal party is very strange. Not one of the great labor unions, including those who want a real American labor party, is backing it. Apart from the Communist press, no outstanding left wing newspaper supports the movement—not even Mr. Wallace's New Republic.

Almost every one of Mr. Wallace's old New Deal associates has left him, including his years' long campaign manager, Harold Young.

Now how do you, Senator Taylor, explain it that some of the men close to Wallace today are notorious Communists or Communist fellow travelers? To name a few: Lee Pressman, fired

C.I.O. counsel for Communist connections; Lew Frank, Communist whip in the American Veterans' Committee; Vito Marcantonio, who has turned the New York Labor Party into a Communist nest too warm even for Michael Quill; Hugh DeLacy, who followed the party line during the Russo-German Pact so closely that he was the only delegate to the 1940 Democratic Convention who voted against the renomination of Franklin Delano Roosevelt; John Gimski, recently dropped from the Wisconsin Democratic Party on charges of Communism; numbers of pro-Communist writers like Gailmore and Huberman, and that unconscionable and sinister character, Johannes Steel.

You have these, Senator Taylor, but where are Mrs. Roosevelt, Harold Ickes, Frank Graham, Ben Cohen, David Lillienthal, William O. Douglas, Robert Jackson, or any of the old prominent New Dealers except Rex Tugwell? Gone, Senator Taylor, gone with the wind!

Now, listen, there is no new tactic in this alliance of left-wing liberals who split their parties to join the Communists and confuse the people. By splitting the Social Democratic and Peasant parties and attaching their left wings, a small minority of Communists conquered Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia.

The strategy is to paste an un-

suspected face over communist features; advance liberal slogans against monopoly — everybody's against monopoly, for the TVA and so on—and ride into power inside a Communist Trojan horse. Once in power, of course, the Communist collaborators are reduced to rubber stamps like President Benes in Czechoslovakia, or liquidated.

So far, all alliances with Communists have ended in total Communist rule. There is not one single exception in the world.

Senator Taylor as a movement for prosperity and peace, a Communist alliance is a macabre joke. Wherever Communists and their allies triumph, the population is reduced to utter pauperism.

Communist alliance do not mean peace, as Mr. Wallace himself said a few years ago. Like the Nazis, Communists promote pacifism in the states they intend to destroy, but prohibit it in the Soviet Union.

War, to Communists, is not inherently evil — all Russia's wars are good and all others must be turned into Communist revolutions. Communist revolutions are themselves pitiless wars against every institution of the democratic state and every civil freedom.

In foreign policy, Mr. Wallace is not thinking beyond old-fashioned power politics, but his very unique contribution is to advance Russian power politics as an American program.

Mr. Wallace's foreign policy



does not differ in a single important detail from the Communists: We should get out of Europe. We should bring Europe into the Ruhr. We should let the Communists take China. We should disarm. And then we should negotiate with the Russians. A bright idea, thank you! (*Applause and laughter.*)

Mr. Wallace has accepted this Communist alliance. Now and then, he plaintively bleats that he really doesn't know much about communism. Maybe, that's true, but it's the first time since the "Know - Nothing" movement that anyone has ever recommended himself for the Presidency of the United States on the grounds that he's deaf, dumb, and blind. The rest of us don't intend to be so. (*Applause.*)

#### **Moderator Denny:**

Thank you, Dorothy Thompson. Now, there's still more to be said on both sides, so let's hear now from a man who has had wide experience in government having served as Special Assistant to the Attorney General from 1942 to 1945 and from December, 1945, to July of last year he served in Germany under the War Department in the Office of Military Government, where he gave special attention to the study of cartels.

Prior to his work in government, he was a member of the faculty of St. John's College in

Annapolis, Maryland, which he still makes his home. Mr. Martin is the author of a forthcoming book called *All Honorable Men* and is presently chairman of the Progressive Party in Maryland supporting Henry Wallace for president. Mr. James Stewart Martin. Mr. Martin. (*Applause.*)

#### **Mr. Martin:**

Miss Thompson, you ignore us Progressives, and devote a lot of time to the threats of communism. And you ignore the much bigger threat to our peace and prosperity which is an accomplished fact, and which is making our professions of justice and humanity a mockery in the eyes of the common people of the world.

You say you are against monopoly, but you do not even mention the barons of finance and industry who have established the foreign policy which our Government is now trying to enforce.

Once war was the sport of kings. Today, it is the problem of all free men. Our democratic form of government means that when our Government is drawn into war, we are all drawn in. Therefore, we cannot allow a few of the so-called "best people" to act like kings and commit our government to policies which merely protect their private interests.

We must end the power of this special circle of tycoons from Wall Street and the National Association of Manufacturers to ignore



the ordinary voting population and to call the shots in both major parties.

Secretary of Commerce Harri-  
man shocked the Latin-Americans  
at Bogota when he warned that  
they must create the "right climate"  
for private investors if they expect  
aid from the United States. The  
Latin-Americans retorted that what  
their countries need is protection  
against foreign investors.

In spite of this, Mr. Harriman  
has just been made the bipartisan  
roving Ambassador for all Amer-  
ican foreign aid. The private in-  
vestors for whom he spoke at  
Bogota are the same giant corpora-  
tions that have captured control  
of our national economy.

Miss Thompson, you have not  
even acknowledged that a handful  
of men in eight big banking and  
industry groups now dominate 250  
huge companies that control over  
two-thirds of the entire industry  
of the United States, leaving less  
than one-third of American in-  
dustry scattered among 262,000  
small and medium-sized inde-  
pendent companies.

These 250 monster corporations  
are the keys to our economy, held  
by the small task force of bankers  
and brass hats who have taken  
over our Government at the top  
merely by having a few of their  
number appointed and confirmed  
in important administrative posts.

This is more than a state within  
a state, it is a whole central gov-  
ernment, no one of whose officers

is elected. The bipartisan govern-  
ment speaks for the hidden private  
government in which we voters  
have no voice even at election  
time. What is our position under  
a foreign policy dictated by invest-  
ment bankers looking for the right  
climate?

America told the world after  
World War II that we wanted full  
production of goods and progres-  
sive elimination of restraints on in-  
ternational trade. We wanted to  
forbid cartels and other monopo-  
listic organizations, not only at  
home, but in areas such as Ger-  
many and Japan where the concen-  
tration of economic power had  
blocked democracy and paved the  
way for military aggression. But  
what is the record?

American financeers now in the  
bipartisan administration took part  
in building up the German finan-  
ceers and heavy industrialists  
who supported Hitler. The two  
groups played ball right up to  
our entry into the war, and by that  
time they had postwar agreements  
worked out.

During the war, Americans of  
the same group opposed any new  
policy which would free Germany  
and Europe from the grip of the  
German cartel system. When they  
were overruled by the Executive  
Departments and by President  
Roosevelt, they set out on a pro-  
gram of sabotage and inaction.

Since the occupation of Germany  
in 1945, Mr. Forrestal, Mr. Harri-  
man, and their associates, inside

and outside the Government, have opposed the effort to break the hold of Germany's military, financial and industrial clique on the postwar economy of Europe. They have not only thrown the weight of the Marshall Plan behind German heavy industry, they have even made the American policy against cartels take an about-face.

For example, on March 10, 1948, General Clay finally killed our chance to keep the German economy from falling back into the hands of the cartelists. He called off the reorganization of the heavy industry cartels, combines, and trusts in Germany. He stopped reorganization of the huge Henschell combine, which made the Tiger Tank and 88 millimeter guns.

He disapproved any change in the ownership of the German properties of SKF, the worldwide bearing cartel, whose American subsidiaries are charged with violating our anti-trust laws.

He called off all attempts to reorganize the Robert Bosch combine, which has retained a retired American general as legal counsel.

General Clay told members of his staff that this change of policy would bring a scream to the high heavens from what he called the strong antitrust group. When 19 of the top members of his decartelization branch did protest the scuttling of their work, General Clay called

them disloyal to their jobs, fired them, and told their chief to find replacements who would conform to the new interpretation of American policy.

Yes, the new party can bring us peace and prosperity. We can expel the tycoons and send them back into business where they belong, if they can find an honest job. We can restore a foreign policy based squarely on democratic principles and on the interests of the American people. We can adopt and enforce legislation to see that economic power does not get out of hand and is used in the interest of the common man and the common good. (*Applause.*)

#### **Moderator Denny:**

Thank you, Mr. Martin. Our next speaker, like Dorothy Thompson, is a journalist, but his career has been quite different. After his graduation from Yale in 1928, he worked as a staff writer on *Fortune* magazine for six years, and then for six years was editor of *Partisan Review*.

He is currently editor and publisher of a magazine called *Politics* and is particularly qualified to participate in tonight's discussion because of his controversial book *Henry Wallace—the Man and the Myth*, which was published in January of this year. Mr. Dwight Macdonald. Mr. Macdonald. (*Applause.*)



**Mr. Macdonald:**

This is a curious debate. Are we discussing a third party or are we discussing General Clay's administration of Germany? There never was a good military government, and there never will be.

Mr. Martin's main argument is directed against the concentration of power in the hands of a few. I agree that all concentration of power is evil, but that argument sounds peculiar, coming from a spokesman for a party that is aligned with Soviet Communism, the greatest monopoly of political and economic power in the world today. This is a charge that he ignores.

Senator Taylor and Mr. Martin have much more to say about the sins of Truman than about the virtues of their third party.

The affirmative, in this debate, is curiously negative. This is understandable, for the third party has no program beyond pious generalities. Henry Wallace has a lot to say about peace. He has had lots to say in the past about other noble abstractions: the general welfare, the century of the common man, etc. and so on. He has always been shy of concrete proposals for realizing these abstractions.

In 13 years in the highest governmental posts, Henry Wallace did not propose or carry out a single important liberal reform. He purged the liberals from the

Department of Agriculture, and I challenge Mr. Martin to distinguish in any way Henry Wallace's policies as Secretary of Commerce from those of his illustrious predecessors, Herbert Hoover and Jesse Jones. (*Applause.*) I'm using illustrious in an ironical sense.

So, too, with peace. Wallace's concrete proposals for peace can be boiled down to four propositions.

1. "The initiation of talks with Marshall Stalin." Roosevelt talked with Stalin at Teheran and Yalta. Truman talked with Stalin at Potsdam. They didn't get peace and they came home without their pants.

2. At the recent Senate hearing on Universal Military Training, Wallace proposed that the United States should immediately withdraw all troops from Europe. Russia will not move in, he promised. "At least," he added, "she would be foolish if she did." This man wants to become President of the United States—a very high and important office.

3. Wallace opposes selective service and UMT. So do I, as a pacifist. But Wallace is not a pacifist. He was a bitter-ender in the last war. He was one of a dozen officials who planned the atomic bomb.

He assured the Senators at the recent UMT hearings that 1,000,000 men could be raised by a call for volunteers. Whereupon one Senator observed that this is ex-

actly 218,000 more men than Secretary Forrestal himself had asked for. Whereupon Wallace admitted that he had "pulled the figure out of the air," and withdrew it.

This crystal-ball swami, who personally guarantees that Russia will not move into Europe—"at least she will be foolish if she did"—this slap-happy statistician, who pulls figures out of the air is a candidate for the Presidency of the United States.

4. Wallace's fourth concrete proposal for peace is what he modestly calls the Wallace Plan. This is a substitute for the Marshall Plan. He proposes a 50 billion dollar world-relief program to be administered through the United Nations. Of this, 25 billions would be put up by the United States.

It's taken five months of effort to put a 6 billion dollar program through Congress—a program administered by our own State Department. What possible chance of getting Congress in the next 25 years to vote 25 billions to the United Nations, including Russia?

On March 10 this rhetorical question was answered. The Senate voted on the Wallace Plan. The vote was 74 to 3 against it—74 to 3.

Senator Taylor, as one of the 3, can you defend the Wallace Plan as a serious proposal for world relief?

Henry Wallace is not interested in peace. His campaign has one

great objective—to do as much damage as possible to the Marshall Plan. This is in line with international strategy of Soviet Russia. The Marshall Plan threatens to give the European peoples a new basis for life, a reconstructed economy. But a ruined, divided, and impoverished Europe is what Russia needs and wants. That's why Wallace talks endlessly about foreign policy, and pays so little attention to domestic policies that in his acceptance speech of December 29 he actually forgot to even mention the Taft-Hartley bill, which is one of the important points of domestic policy.

That's why, in Congressional elections throughout the country, liberal Democrats who oppose the Marshall Plan are threatened with candidates from the third party, which, of course, will split the liberal vote and will elect Republicans.

This country, says Henry Wallace, must come to an understanding with Russia. His method is simple—give Russia whatever she wants, whitewash Russia's foreign policy, blacken our own. There is a word for this, and it is not peace; it is appeasement. Henry Wallace is not an agent of Moscow, but he certainly acts like one. (*Applause.*)

**Moderator Denny:**

Thank you, Dwight Macdonald. Now, gentlemen, will you and Miss Thompson join us around the microphone while we have a



little speakers' discussion before we take the questions from this Charlotte audience. Senator Taylor, will you start it off?

**Senator Taylor:** Miss Thompson has taken the usual course of smearing the new party as Red. I may say that Adolf Hitler smeared everybody that disagreed with him as being Reds. Then they woke up one day and found that they were enslaved by fascism.

I may say that President Roosevelt was always smeared as a Red. Miss Thompson asks where are the liberals, and she gives a long list

of them, and says they are gone with the wind.

I can tell you where the liberals are, Miss Thompson. They are on the outside looking in, just like the Southern Democrats. (*Applause.*) They don't know where to go. They know they don't want Truman. They're afraid to go with Wallace because they can't stand up against the Red smear. They'll never find a place to go where they can be liberals and not be smeared as Reds, so they are indeed in a bad position. (*Applause.*)

You ask who is on our side.

## THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

**DOROTHY THOMPSON** — Miss Thompson is one of the most widely read commentators on world affairs. Her writings, syndicated to more than a hundred newspapers, reach a large audience. She began her journalistic career in London for *International News*, and her subsequent work for the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* in Vienna and Berlin during the rise of the Nazis put her among the principal foreign correspondents. Miss Thompson met Hitler in 1931 when she interviewed him for a leading magazine. Following her graduation from Syracuse University, Miss Thompson spent several years doing social work. She is author of *Let the Record Speak*, *The New Russia*, and *I Saw Hitler*.

**GLEN H. TAYLOR** — Born in Portland, Oregon, in 1904, Glen Taylor is now a Democratic Senator from Idaho, and vice-presidential candidate on Henry Wallace's New Party ticket. Educated in the public schools, he became a sheet metal worker's apprentice in 1919, but in 1921, he joined a dramatic stock company of which he became a partner. Since 1926, he has been in the entertainment field as owner and business manager of various enterprises. During the war Senator Taylor went back to his trade in sheet metal as a mechanic in an ordnance plant in San Francisco.

Senator Taylor began studying economics and government because of the

hardships he endured and the suffering of others that he witnessed in his travels during the depression. He ran for Congress in 1938 and was fourth in a field of nine in the primaries. He ran for the Senate in 1940 and was nominated but defeated in the election. He ran again in 1942, and was elected in 1944. He is a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

**JAMES STEWART MARTIN** — An attorney, Mr. Martin is chairman of the Progressive Party in Maryland supporting Henry Wallace for President. For three war years, Mr. Martin headed the economic Warfare Section of the Department of Justice. Early in 1945, he went overseas to investigate the economic systems of the Axis countries and to take part in rounding up and interviewing top Nazi industrialists. Thereafter, until his resignation in July, 1947, he was chief of the Decartelization Branch of Military Government and U. S. Control Officer for the I. G. Farben combine, stationed in Berlin.

**DWIGHT MACDONALD** — With a Yale background, Dwight MacDonald has worked at Macy's but later was a staff writer on *Fortune*. He became an editor of *Partisan Review* and is now editor and publisher of *Politics*. His book, *Henry Wallace: The Man and the Myth*, came off the presses recently.

Well, former Senator Benson of Minnesota, he's a big landowner, a big farmer out there, he's with us. Mr. Tugwell is with us. And I may say that Professor Einstein is with us, and I'm very happy to have him. (*Applause.*)

Where were the liberals when Hitler took over. They were like a lot of liberals in America. They were too frightened by the Red smear to stand up and be counted. (*Applause.*)

**Mr. Denny:** All right, thank you. Miss Thompson? You have a beautiful red dress on tonight, so step right up.

**Miss Thompson:** In the first place, Senator Taylor, don't you mention me in the same breath with Adolf Hitler. Adolf Hitler knew better about me than you do. I was the very first American he ever threw out of the Third Reich. (*Applause.*)

Now in the second place, I'm not making a Red smear. I am making a charge which is a very serious charge. I am charging that what you call the new party is in intimate association with the American Communist Party. I am charging that the American Communist Party is a section of the International Communist Party and is absolutely ruled by the Politburo of the Soviet Union.

Now you can't get out. That's a very definite charge and I've named names, and I'll name some more if you want me to. But that's a definite charge and you

can't get out of it by talking about Red smears. The Communist Party is a fact in the world, Senator Taylor, and it's a fact that you're working with it hand in glove.

I will ask you a question. In what particular does your foreign policy differ from that of the Communist Party? (*Applause.*)

**Senator Taylor:** "In what particular does our foreign policy differ from the Communist foreign policy?" It happens that I like to eat and Communists also like to eat and it happens that I'm opposed to our foreign policy and it happens that the Communists also happen to be opposed to our foreign policy.

They smear you every time you take a stand regardless of when you took it if the Communists happen to come up with the same stand on any given issue.

I may say, Miss Thompson, that you once said that Adolf Hitler was a little man and there was no possible danger of him ever becoming a dictator. You were mistaken, Miss Thompson, and it stands to reason that you can very well be mistaken about Henry Wallace and the New Party, also. (*Applause.*)

**Mr. Denny:** Mr. Martin, step right up.

**Mr. Martin:** Miss Thompson, I'd just like to point out that according to the United Press survey of last year there are 70,000 members of the Communist Party in the United States and the party which



wins the next election will have to have something like 20,000,000 votes. Even the conservative columnists give us 10,000,000, and I suggest that any thousand good Americans would be able to control seven Communists, if all the Communists are voting for us, which I doubt. (*Applause.*)

**Miss Thompson:** It really seems to me that all this is missing the point of my accusation. First of all, I don't know whether there are 70,000 Communists. It seems to me I know more than that personally. (*Laughter.*) But, at any rate, that is not the point. I asked in what particular does your foreign policy differ from that of the Communist Party, and Senator Taylor, you don't answer that.

Now I can tell you what the Communist policy is, and it's just exactly the policy of your party. We should bring the Communists into the Ruhr; for instance, we should bring Russia into the Ruhr. Why? In return for what *quid pro quo*?

Why don't you say that we should have a four-power control of the eastern coal basin of Europe? Not at all; we should get out of Greece, we should get out of China—no *quid pro quo*. We should disarm—no *quid pro quo*. I want to know — I'm asking a particular question, and don't welsh on it. (*Laughter and applause.*)

**Senator Taylor:** I'm glad you explained the Communist position to me, Miss Thompson, and I may

say that you know many more Communists than I do. I doubt if I know a dozen. (*Applause.*) If that is the Communist position then there are indeed differences between the foreign policy I believe in and the Communist position.

I don't feel that we should get out of Greece and these other places and get nothing in return from the Communists. I believe that we should sit down with them and agree that both of us call off this business of pushing people around and trying to expand our holdings all over the world. We are doing it as well as the Communists are. I want to see us disarm, but I don't want to see us disarm unless the Communists do. I believe that they will agree to disarm if we will, if we show them that we really want peace. (*Shouts.*) May I point out that Litvinoff offered, asked the world to disarm in 1933 at the League of Nations and the Western World just laughed at him.

**Mr. Denny:** Thank you, Senator Taylor. Now, Mr. Macdonald, you've been awfully quiet.

**Mr. Macdonald:** Well, I'd just like to ask where Litvinoff is right now? He's out of power, to say the least.

But I want to ask a serious question of Senator Taylor, having to do with Senatorial elections this fall. In Illinois, a well-known liberal, Paul Douglas, is running for Senator on the Democratic

ticket. Another active liberal, Adlai Stevenson, is running for Governor on the same ticket. The third party a few weeks ago nominated two rival candidates, one of whom has defended Communists in liberal organizations, while the other is connected with a well-known communist-line trade union.

This move obviously will split the liberal vote and will probably insure the election of the Republican nominee, one of whom is Senator Charles Brooks, who is the *Chicago Tribune* candidate and who is the closest to a reasonable facsimile of a Fascist as there is in the United States Senate today. I'm sure that Senator Taylor will agree with this.

Now, I'd just like to know this: Is there any reason for putting up these two third party candidates to split the liberal vote against these candidates? Is there any reason except that both Douglas and Stevenson are opposed to the Marshall Plan?

**Mr. Denny:** Thank you, Mr. Martin, do you want to take that one up?

**Mr. Macdonald:** I want Senator Taylor to answer.

**Mr. Denny:** Oh, you want Senator Taylor—all right.

**Senator Taylor:** The new party is going to back liberal candidates wherever we possibly can, but when candidates come out and deliberately attack the new party and attack Henry Wallace, I don't

see how we can be expected to support them. That's what has happened in Illinois. We don't ask them to support us, we don't ask them to brag on Henry Wallace, or anything else. All we ask is that they do not publicly condemn us so we can get our people to support them, but when they do it's obviously impossible to get people to support somebody who is openly condemning them.

**Mr. Denny:** Thank you, and now while we get ready for our question period, I'm sure that you, our listeners, will be interested in the following message.

**Announcer:** You are listening to America's Town Meeting of the Air originating in Charlotte, North Carolina, where we are discussing the question, "Will the Third Party Bring Us Peace and Prosperity?" We are about to take questions from the audience.

If you would like a copy of tonight's broadcast, complete with the questions and answers to follow, send for the Town Meeting Bulletin, enclosing ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. If you would like to subscribe to the Bulletin for six months, send \$2.35; or for a year, send \$4.50. Just address Town Hall, New York 18, New York, and allow at least two weeks for delivery.

Perhaps you have already been approached, indeed, perhaps you have already made a contribution to the American Cancer Society's



drive for funds. But still, this deadly disease continues to strike down our friends and members of our families from ambush.

A recent Gallup Poll has shown that more Americans fear cancer than any other disease. When you realize that every three minutes someone dies of cancer, you can see why this fear is so widespread. But we can and will stop this killer if we get together and attack it on every front.

The American Cancer Society through its three-fold program of education, service and research is putting up a relentless fight to conquer cancer once and for all — but they need our support — yours and mine, to carry on their vital work. So let's all give generously to the American Cancer Society's drive for funds. Give more than before!

Now for our question period, we return you to Mr. Denny.

---

## QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

*Mr. Denny:* Our attendants are out here in the aisle with this fine Charlotte audience with portable microphones. The members of the audience are holding up number cards to indicate to me the names of the persons to whom their questions are directed. I'll take a question from the gentleman here on the third row, for Senator Taylor.

*Man:* Senator Taylor. How can you advocate co-operation with Russia after she turned down the Morgenthau Plan for international atomic control?

*Senator Taylor:* I believe that Russia turned down the atomic plan because they don't want anybody in their country seeing what they haven't got, not what they have got. Russia is terribly devastated. They lost some 20 million people in the war; their country was laid waste. If our country was equally devastated it would be laid waste from Kansas City east.

Not Kansas City west, but Kansas City east. All of our great industrial sections would be rubble. Our farms in this great section of the Eastern United States, the Mississippi Valley and all east of that, the farm buildings would be flat, the implements gone, the livestock gone. All our industries flat, people living in the bricked up remains of their basements and what were once their homes.

Under those circumstances we wouldn't want to fight anybody, and if Russia had the atomic bomb and was powerful, we wouldn't want them in here seeing how weak we were, if they were making threats about what they were going to do to us, as many in America are making threats against Russia today. I believe that's why they turned down the atomic proposal.

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. Now the lady over here.

*Lady:* Miss Thompson, what is your definition of a Communist?

*Mr. Denny:* What is your definition of a Communist?

*Miss Thompson:* A Communist is a member of or a close collaborator with an international organization run by the Politburo in Moscow whose object it is to bring about a Communistic dictatorship in every state of the world. That has been the Communist program since 1920. It is in all its documents. It is in all its literature. It's in its semi-secret literature, in its inter-party press.

I have studied it very closely and have come very closely in touch with it for very many years in this country and elsewhere, and I only wish Senator Taylor knew more about it, because if he did he wouldn't be in this alliance. I'm positive of it. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. The next question please.

*Man:* This question is for Mr. Martin. Mr. Martin, you said we have turned around in breaking up German cartels. Hasn't our Government done a good job against cartels in Japan?

*Mr. Martin:* Mr. Forrestal's Under-Secretary of the Army, General Draper, just returned from Japan with recommendations that amount to the same about-face on the treatment of the great Zaibatsu family holding companies in Japan. The Zaibatsu companies were exposed not more than six months ago in a big scandal. They had

stolen and siphoned off into the black market a large share of some three billion dollars worth of critical raw materials that now have to be made good by the American taxpayer to get Japanese production going, but these able members of Japan's prewar industrial elite are still considered indispensable, so the able investment bankers of the Army Department tell us.

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. The young lady down here.

*Lady:* Mr. Macdonald, is not the present partition coalition leading us to an economic depression by refusing to enact price control measures?

*Mr. Denny:* I don't know what that's got to do with the third party. I think we ought to have a question that has to do with the third party. Do you want to comment on it?

*Mr. Macdonald:* I'll just say briefly that it is my impression that the Truman Administration is in favor of price control. I really don't see the connection.

*Dr. Denny:* Thank you. Mr. Truman himself is for it. That's right. The gentleman here on the fourth row. Yes? Quickly please.

*Man:* Senator Taylor. In support of your stated belief, give us something concrete. How will Henry Wallace constrain a Russian expansion policy that's been in effect since Peter the Great?

*Senator Taylor:* Well, simply because something always has been is no reason why it always will

be. Henry Wallace, as I have said previously, is the only American who hasn't nearly every day, at least every week, denounced the Russians and everything they do or fail to do. When he is elected President, the Russians will know that they can have confidence in his peaceful intentions, his good intentions.

By electing him, the American people will demonstrate that they want peace. Then he can sit down and talk the matter over with them and I believe that he can come to a conclusion and establish an honorable peace.

The Russians have no reason to want to fight. Nobody in Russia gets rich off of war and they have lots of land and lots of people and lots of resources and I think they would like to just be left to develop those resources.

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. The young lady here.

*Lady:* Mr. Martin. On what basis would you advocate dealing with Russia, economically or politically, and if you make this distinction do you think Russia would make the same in dealing with us?

*Mr. Martin:* I think that the way of dealing with Russia, economically and politically, are somewhat different. Economically, all that we need to do in dealing with Russia is to trade with the countries of Eastern Europe and let them trade with the countries of Western Europe and keep the

channels of international trade open. Politically, our first problem is to get our own political and economic structure sound so that the American policy is eminently clear to all countries of the world, including the small nations, and that we are not putting ourselves in the position of stepping into the small nations with one foot, with the idea of helping them, and with the other foot, with the idea of making a good thing for certain ones of our private interest groups. That's the thing that gives the Communists the first hand.

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. The young lady in the balcony, please.

*Lady:* My question is for Dorothy Thompson. Will not a third party so weaken our present system as to make government ineffectual?

*Miss Thompson:* Well, I don't know that a third party or that any third party would weaken our governmental system. I think that there's much room for criticism of the bipartisan foreign policy. I've criticized it perhaps longer and more consistently than anybody else, but I object to *this* third party, which certainly will weaken our structure, because it's going to bring a great many enemies of our structure into prominent positions—the Communists. They are certainly enemies of our state, and our form of state, and our institutions.

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. The young man in the center there.

*Man:* Senator Taylor, you have been quoted as saying that we



have lost every friend in the world. Can you substantiate that statement?

*Senator Taylor:* Well, yes, I believe I can. We have given the Philippines a phoney independence, and kept bases in the Philippines. I'm sure we've lost most of our friends in the Philippines. We have repudiated our decartelization program in Japan. I don't believe that pleased the common people of Japan. We have helped Chiang Kai-Shek in China and made enemies out of the Chinese people. We have helped the Frenchmen to reconquer Indo-China. We have helped the Dutch to recall Indonesia. We are exploiting the Arabians—their oil over there. We are helping a reactionary regime in Greece, and in Turkey. We are building up the cartelists in Germany again. We have lost friends all over the world.

Even Herbert Hoover the other day said that in case of a war we could not be sure of a single ally in the whole world, and, when it becomes apparent to Herbert Hoover, it must be plain enough for anybody to see. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. Miss Thompson, come on. Just a minute, we want to hear from Miss Thompson.

*Miss Thompson:* It's not my business to defend Herbert Hoover, but that's a complete misrepresentation of his meaning. Herbert Hoover meant that the world is so

weakened, in particular Europe is so frightfully weakened—and England, Britain—that there is no great strength anywhere in the world that could be relied on as an ally in time of war, and also nobody wants the world used as a battleground. But the idea that we have no friends in the world—I must say I've been in Europe several times since the war, and, after all, last week in Italy we apparently had some friends who won a very large majority at the polls. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Senator Taylor?

*Senator Taylor:* I would like to say that all know about Hoover is what I read in the paper. I didn't talk it over with him and have his explanation of it at all. We did win the election in Italy. As it comes out, we spent \$4,000,000 besides all the aid we've put in there. One paper up in Boston said that we bought the votes in the best Pendergast tradition.

*Mr. Martin:* I'd just like to ask Miss Thompson one additional question. She did not comment on the people in Greece, Indonesia, and other places. Does she think we have some friends there in the event of war?

*Mr. Denny:* Miss Thompson?

*Miss Thompson:* I know perfectly well we have a great many friends in Greece—a great many. I was in Greece just after the attempted coup of the Communist-led guerillas when they marched

on Athens in force and tried to take the state over by force. I was there very shortly after and very poor and ragged and hungry people said they thanked God for Britain—that it had saved them from a Red massacre.

I'm tired of this idea that everywhere in the world the common people are on the side of the Reds. Everywhere in the world they're afraid of them because wherever they go there is terror. I tell you we could win a vote in Czechoslovakia tomorrow morning, if you could get a free vote. And we could win a free vote in Poland tomorrow morning, if you could get a free vote. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. Senator Taylor?

*Senator Taylor:* If the Greeks are so friendly to us, how does it come that after one year—we've been there a year, and we've spent 300 million dollars, and when we went in there were 13,000 guerillas and now there are 26,000 guerillas. We're really doing good!

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. Question here.

*Man:* This question is to Mr. Martin.

*Mr. Denny:* Well, you had a No. 4 card for Mr. Macdonald.

*Man:* Yes, for Mr. Macdonald. Why has the Progressive Party, whose policies appear to more nearly symbolize true American democracy for all, been labeled as a party with communistic leanings?

*Mr. Macdonald:* Well, I can

answer that very briefly. It's been labeled by Miss Thompson and myself as a communist front because it is. We've given all the evidence—I don't know how I can convince you any more. I might add that the fact that the Progressive Party constantly proclaims its Americanism, and so on, doesn't prove that that's the case at all.

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. The young lady. Oh, did you want to comment, Senator Taylor?

*Senator Taylor:* It seems to me that Mr. Macdonald calling us Communists is "the pot calling the kettle black." It is my understanding that Mr. Macdonald was a Trotskyite at one time—a disciple of Leon Trotsky. He even trims his whiskers so he looks like him. (*Laughter.*) He claims to have broken with Trotsky, and I don't blame him, because I understand that Mr. Trotsky once said of Mr. Macdonald that "it's every man's privilege to be stupid but Mr. Macdonald abuses the privilege." (*Laughter.*)

*Mr. Macdonald:* I was going to point out that it is true, I was a Trotskyist for two years, and I learned a great deal at that time, especially about the Communists, oddly enough, and I was going to point out that I wish that Senator Taylor had also been through that experience. He might be a little more sophisticated about the Communists. However, I must say that for him to have known this very

obscure remark of Trotsky's which was only printed in an internal bulletin of Trotsky's movement, I think shows very clearly that his speeches are written by somebody beside himself. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. Now, while our speakers prepare their summaries of tonight's question, here's a special message of interest to you.

*Announcer:* When we arrived in Charlotte, we were pleased to learn of a very active local Town Meeting listening group which meets every Tuesday night in the studios of Station WAYS to hear our program and to discuss the issue. The Charlotte chapter of America's Town Meeting is typical of many similar groups of listeners being formed by representative citizens across the Nation.

Immediately following the broadcast the Charlotte listeners hear further discussion by local speakers who are well-versed on the evening subject. Then they ask questions and exchange views. This is America's Town Meeting in action but more important it is democracy at work.

Why not form your own local Town Meeting? It is really very simple. You can have your own Town Meeting in your own home, club, school, or church. It's fun; it's good citizenship; it's neighborly.

We will be glad to provide you with suggestions for organization and conduct of your own discus-

sions. Just write us for this material. Address your request to Town Hall, New York 18, N.Y.

Now for the summaries of tonight's speakers, here is Mr. Denny.

*Mr. Denny:* Miss Thompson may we hear you with your summary of tonight's discussion, "Will the Third Party Bring Us Peace and Prosperity?"

*Miss Thompson:* Mr. Macdonald and I have charged that the new party is in closest alliance with the American Communist Party and that the American Communist Party is governed by the Russian Politburo in the interests of the expanding Russian dictatorship. We do not feel that this charge has once been straightforwardly or satisfactorily answered.

We deny as a falsehood Mr. Wallace's repeated statement that he will not accept support from any group owing primary allegiance to a foreign power. We state that every Communist party member in the world owes blind obedience to the Russian State and International Party.

We remind the American people that every alliance of liberals and Communists has ended in Communist dictatorship. In making this serious charge, we do not associate ourselves uncritically with the present foreign policy or domestic policy, but we warn that to admit Communists into government would mean the end of any American foreign policy and the end of



the American Republic. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Miss Thompson. Now a final word from Senator Taylor.

Senator Taylor: I flatly deny that the new party is controlled by Communists or that there is any significant number of Communists mixed up in the new party, as far as that goes.

I do declare that the German cartelists started two world wars with the hope of exploiting the world for profit, and I declare that our cartelists and monopolists have decided to take over where Hitler's cartelists left off. If you think I am exaggerating, I want to read one sentence from a brochure prepared by the Office of Naval Intelligence for the use of the Senate Appropriations Committee recently. This was supposed to be for the Committee—not public consumption.

It says, "Realistically all wars have been for economic reasons. To make them politically and socially palatable, ideological issues have always been invoked. Any possible future war will undoubtedly conform to historical precedent." It's pretty blunt, but there it is. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Taylor, Dorothy Thompson, James Stewart Martin, and Dwight Macdonald. Also, our warm thanks go to our Town Meeting host com-

mittee, headed by Mayor Baxter of Charlotte, Mr. G. W. Doughty, Mr. J. E. Dowd, the *Charlotte News*, and radio station WAYS.

Now remember friends, if you want a copy of tonight's discussion, you may obtain it by sending ten cents to Town Hall, New York 18.

There are some questions so important that we have to discuss them more than once on Town Meeting with slightly different emphasis. Next week, one of the compelling questions before the world will be discussed by Town Meeting when we originate in Lexington, Kentucky. The subject will be, "Should the United Nations Be Revised With or Without Russia Now?" Our speakers will be Congressman Estes Kefauver, Democrat of Tennessee; Ely Culbertson, author and lecturer; A. H. Feller, general counsel and director of the Legal Department of the United Nations; and Congressman Jacob K. Javits, Republican of New York, member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Be a Town Crier yourself, friends, and use the modern Town Crier's bell, your own telephone. Call your friends and remind them of this important broadcast next week at this very same time and make your own plans to be with us next Tuesday and every Tuesday night at the sound of crier's bell. (*Applause.*)

**STILL AVAILABLE at \$1.00 (Postpaid)**

A limited number of copies of

# **500 HOURS OLD**

A record of the first 500 broadcasts of "America's Town Meeting of the Air," including in its 48 pages - - -

**Titles and Panels of all 500 Programs**

**Names of all 1176 Speakers**

**Thirty-two Photographs, etc.**

**Order from Town Hall, Inc., 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y.**